arXiv:1703.03703v1 [quant-ph] 10 Mar 2017

Quantum Behavior Revealed by Divergent Wavefunction

Hao Jiang[1,*] and Guanghan Cao[2]

[1] School of Physics and Optoelectronics, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan 411105, China
[2] Department of Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China

A continuous energy transfer method that the boundary condition is no longer needed as the solving prerequisite which will be satisfied spontaneously, is built based on transfer matrix method to solve the eigenfunction of arbitrary energy. This kind of eigenstates is generally divergent, and diverging with informations about convergent states. The divergent state will inevitably reach convergent state by self-tuning and exchanging energy with outside in an efficient and concise way. The divergent state conforms to the Uncertainty Principle, which confirms the expression of energy distribution. Probability is running into troubles with normalizing divergent states. While, energy distribution is able to normalize and interpret the divergent state as well as convergent state. Finally, we propose the divergence criterion that is quite reliable in judging or seeking the stationary states including ground state and excited states.

I. INTRODUCTION

In math, boundary condition acts an important factor in solving the problem described by partial differential equation. Different boundary conditions bring out different solutions. In quantum domain, related problem is described by shoediger equation. Its boundary condition depends on the circumstance. It deserves deep thinking that why the boundary condition is what it is, while the statement given by probability interpretation is so farfetched. Generally, this boundary condition is always convergent, such as bound state, the wavefunction at infinity should be zero. It is requested by probability that wavefunction should be limited. In history, the reasonability and correctness of probability interpretation are the bones of contention. So far, Its correctness is undoubt. Its reasonability may be the best one until it had failed to interpret some phenomena.

At bound situation, energy is generally discrete. From the angle of math, the discreteness is caused by boundary condition. If the boundary condition is free, arbitrary energy has its corresponding eigenfunction. Moreover, the number of eigenfunction is infinite. Just as the question raised previously, people are always capable to know what the boundary condition is, but the underlying reason is not so clear. As a result, if release the boundary condition, what do the quantum laws look like under open boundary condition? Our research indicate that do it like this is much meaningful. Immediately, a convinced answer is available for the previous question. Because it can be answered from the angle of the stability of different boundary conditions[1].

In fact, the derivation of Uncertain Relationship haven't required that the wavefunction should be normalized and convergent. That is, at open boundary condition, Uncertain Relationship will also work. Our study of open boundary condition originate from the establishment of continuous energy transfer method, which is based on transfer matrix method and is little similar to Numerov-type method[2] at some angles of view.

It is maturational to solve 1D quantum problems by transfer matrix method[4–7]. This method possess advantages[8] such as fast speed, high precision and so on, and some defects have been well settled[9, 10], such as the singularity at $E = V$. Some related method have also been developed, such as Numerov-type method, quantum transmitting boundary method[3].

By treating energy as a continuous variate and other means, we have established a continuous energy transfer method(CETM) based on transfer matrix method(TMM). CETM inherits and develops the advantages of TMM. More importantly, CETM is able to exactly solve eigenstates of arbitrary energy. After strict study, we conclude that wavefunction of arbitrary energy is indeed divergent. Convergent state(CS) is just the particular case of divergent state(DS). Admitting that it's hard to detect DS in experiment. Our study indicate that DS is as important as CS, and DS reveals some new meaningful quantum behaviors, which enable us to learn more about the essence of quantum phenomena.

II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF 1D CETM

Firstly, we will introduce the establishment of one dimension(1D) time-independent CETM. Considering a segmented potential[13], of which the total segment number is N, the solution of time-independent Schrödinger equation on certain segment is the superposition of plane wave[6, 8]. That is: $\Psi_i = A_i e^{-\mathrm{i}k_i x} + B_i e^{\mathrm{i}k_i x}$, where $k_i = \sqrt{2m(E - V_i)}$, [14]and A_i, B_i are coefficient. Natural unit is adopted in this work, namely $\hbar = 1$, mass $m = 1$ and so on. According to continuity condition, there are two equations at border x_i. They are: $\Psi_i(x_i) = \Psi_{i+1}(x_i)$ and $\Psi_i'(x_i) = \Psi_{i+1}'(x_i)$. The transfer relations is obtained by solving the equations set.

The forenamed description is consistent with literature. The following treatment and way of thinking will be totally different from TMM.

* Corresponding author. E-mail address:hjiang@xtu.edu.cn

At a certain border, two independent equations, among which there are five unknown quantities A_i, B_i, A_{i+1}, B_{i+1}, E, are procurable by continuity condition. All tries in finding the third equation are failure. Probability conservation, and so on, are all included in the two equations. However, utilizing infinity boundary condition to solve $2N$ simultaneous equations set, such as TMM, is insufficiently concise. Under normal circumstances, A_i, B_i in expression Ψ_i is unknown. Since wavefunction multiplied by a nonzero number doesn't change its eigenvalue, when choosing $i = j$ as the transfer starting point, it's secure to set $A_j = 1$ excepting for start at ∞. If energy E is treated as a continuous variate, in order to obtain the eigenstate of specific energy, we could assign an arbitrary value to B_j. Then there are only two variates A_{j+1}, B_{j+1} left. Now, we can obtain the wavefunction $\Psi(E, A_j = 1, B_j)$ by above transfer relations. Without doubt, the Ψ obtained by CETM satisfy $\hat{H}\Psi = E\Psi$, namely the solutions of CETM are energy eigenstates without exception.

Above is the base content of CETM. The main differences from other methods are treating energy as a continuous variate, discarding boundary condition and meeting the continuity condition to the greatest extent, which make CETM quite suitable to exactly solve the eigenstates of arbitrary energy. In practice, CETM is much faster than TMM and other methods[15].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Figure 1 shows the real part[16] of wavefunctions Ψ obtained by CETM. These wavefunctions can be classified in two groups. α states: $\Psi(-\infty) = \pm\infty$ and $\Psi(\infty) = \mp\infty$, such as the red and light red line in figure 1 b. β states: $\Psi(-\infty) = \pm\infty$ and $\Psi(\infty) = \pm\infty$. Detailedly, $\pm\beta$ is grouped by the divergence direction, such as the green and light green line in figure 1 b. When transfer start at $x = \infty$, all states obtained are belong to β states, such as the states in Figure 1 a.

As for segmented potential itself, the derivation process of CETM didn't import any approximation, meanwhile CETM can farthest meet continuity condition[17]. To guarantee the divergent wavefunction is not caused by the error of numerical calculation, fairly strict calculations had been carried out by symbol operating system Mathematica and Maple. (I), For $N \leq 25$, the basic result of pure symbol simulation is consistent with numerical simulation; (II), For $N = 1000$, numerical simulations from double precision to one million significant digits have been carried out. The results consistently show that the eigen energy obtained by double precision has 15 bits of accuracy, namely, with increasing significant digits, the first 15 bits of eigen energy remain unchanged. In addition, from double precision to one million significant digits, the wavefunctions of different precision are coincident in most scope and divergent in the same direction without exception. It only become distinguishable



FIG. 1. (Color on line)**Wavefunctions of arbitrary energy.** Normalized eigenstates of 1D segmented harmonic oscillator($V = \frac{1}{2}x^2$) obtained by CETM are showed, where $N = 10000$. Black dotted line is the analytic solution of ground state of harmonic oscillator. (a) Transfer start at $x = \infty$. x_d labeled position is the area where CETM solution deviate from analytic solution. (b) Transfer start at $x = 0$.

at infinity. If the divergence is induced by numerical error, the diverging direction should be random; (III), The eigen energy of CS obtained by CETM is consistent with the results of other methods; (IV), the direction of divergence presents obvious regularity, to which the precision drop is harmful. Importantly, the divergent direction is uniquely dependent on the sign of ΔE. So, there must be a CS between two DS which diverge in different direction; (V), For different energy E and the corresponding position x_d of starting divergence, it will be proved in the following that they satisfy the uncertainty relation: $|\Delta E \Delta x| \geq \frac{\hbar}{2m}|\overline{p}|$. Taken together, we confirm that our results are not caused by systematic error, and this kind of eigenfunctions is indeed divergent. Such being the case, there are three questions must be asked. (i), What does the position x_d denote? (ii), How to interpret the divergence in wavefunction? (iii), What's the difference of two diverging directions? We will discuss and answer the three questions in the following.

A. What does the position x_d denote?

By observing Figure 1 a, one could get such laws: The closer to ground state the energy E is, the further to the left the x_d moves. Similar results also exist around excited states. After treating energy as a continuous variate, these energy eigenstates are not always stable, which imply energy E also shows uncertainty. So there should be some kind of uncertainty relation between energy E and x_d. We get the expression of uncertainty relation between ΔE and Δx through commutation relation, that is $\Delta E \Delta x \geq \frac{\hbar}{2m}|\overline{p}|$. There is no problem to interpret it with probability at CS. As for DS, $\Delta E \neq 0$, generally,

$\overline{p} \neq 0$, and its wavefunction is divergent. Including excited states, the most reasonable interpretation of ΔE is $\Delta E = |E - E_n|$, E means arbitrary energy, E_n means the energy of nearest CS. Δx is inversely proportional to ΔE. Taking notice of that the larger ΔE is, the smaller $|x_d|$ is. It leads us to consider that Δx potentially equals to $|x_d|$.

In order to confirm the definition of the members in uncertainty relation: $|\Delta E \Delta x| \geq \frac{\hbar}{2m}|\overline{p}|$. Firstly, by solving wavefunctions at different energy, we collected the value of corresponding x_d of different ΔE. We will fit these data in the following.

The two biggest difficulties of fitting are that the mean momentum $\overline{p}$ changes with energy E and the normalization of a divergent wavefunction. $\langle\Psi|\hat{p}|\Psi\rangle$ can't get the result directly, since $|\Psi\rangle$ is divergent. What's more, the divergent part of wavefunction can't be interpreted by probability directly as well. Continuous energy has led to divergence, and then brought new challenges. After a basket of failed attempts, we finally found an easy but valid way to normalize a DS and to get the mean momentum $\overline{p}$ of DS. To begin with quantum optics, as is known, the expression of the total energy of electromagnetic is

$$H = \frac{1}{8\pi}\int(\mathbf{E}^2 + \mathbf{B}^2)\mathrm{d}\upsilon \qquad \text{(CGS)}. \tag{1}$$

The operator form can be written as

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{8\pi}\int(\hat{\mathbf{E}}^2 + \hat{\mathbf{B}}^2)\mathrm{d}\upsilon. \tag{2}$$

After integration, $\hat{H}$ can be expressed by particle number representation, namely

$$\hat{H} = \sum_j \hbar\omega_j(a_j^+ a_j + \frac{1}{2}). \tag{3}$$

Consider a single-model field, $\hat{H} = \hbar\omega(a^+a + \frac{1}{2})$. The corresponding eigenfunction is $\Psi(q)$, where $q = C(a+a^*)$. Now, we are going to figure out the meaning of $\Psi^*\hat{H}\Psi$. Utilize expression 2, we get

$$\Psi^*\hat{H}\Psi = \frac{1}{8\pi}\Psi^*\int(\hat{\mathbf{E}}^2 + \hat{\mathbf{B}}^2)\mathrm{d}\upsilon\Psi. \tag{4}$$

Through Fourier transform, $\Psi(q) = \int\psi(\mathbf{r})e^{iqr}\mathrm{d}\upsilon$, So equation 4 can be write as

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^*\hat{H}\Psi &= \frac{1}{8\pi}\int(\psi(\mathbf{r})^*\hat{\mathbf{E}}^2 + \hat{\mathbf{B}}^2)\psi(\mathbf{r})\mathrm{d}\upsilon \\ &= \langle\psi(\mathbf{r})|\frac{1}{8\pi}(\hat{\mathbf{E}}^2 + \hat{\mathbf{B}}^2)|\psi(\mathbf{r})\rangle \\ &= \overline{\frac{1}{8\pi}(\mathbf{E^2} + \mathbf{B^2})}.\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

From equation 5, we know that $\Psi^*\hat{H}\Psi$ is energy distribution averaged in space. $\Psi^*\hat{H}\Psi$ is a function of q. Replace the representation, $\psi(\mathbf{r})^*\hat{H}\psi(\mathbf{r})$ is energy distribution averaged in q. It's a function of space. To generalize, if an eigenstate has been normalized by $\langle\Psi(\mathbf{r})|\Psi(\mathbf{r})\rangle = \langle\psi(\mathbf{r})|\hat{H}|\psi(\mathbf{r})\rangle = E$, which could be unscrambled by energy conservation principle, $\Psi(\mathbf{r})^*\Psi(\mathbf{r})$ is the density of energy distributing in space.

Taking together, Normalization Principle is just the other form of Energy Conservation Principle, and probability distribution is proportional to energy distribution. If we Know the energy distribution, in turn, we know the probability distribution. Let's reexamine the wavefunctions of DS in figure 1. The left side wavefunctions of x_d are divergent part(DP), and the right side wavefunctions of x_d are coincide with CS, namely normal part(NP). The DP denotes unstable, so under the concept of eneger distributing, it should correspond to ΔE. For $E_n < E < E_m$, the total energy distribution is E. $E = E_n + \Delta E$, so the NP correspond to E_n. Now, the total probability of the left side is $\frac{\Delta E}{E}$. For $E_m < E < E_n$, $\Delta E < 0$, but we know that, in this system, real existing energy must bigger then zero. So the DP doesn't distribute real energy. The total energy E is all distributed to NP. Actually, probability must be positive value, so the total probability is $|E - E_n| + E = E_n$. The total probability of the left side is $\frac{\Delta E}{E_n}$. Normally, $\overline{p} = \langle\Psi|\hat{p}|\Psi\rangle$. It's the integration of $\Psi^*\hat{p}\Psi = \Psi^*\Psi \times |k|$, here Ψ is momentum eigenstate. As well as, the wavefunctions in one segmented potential of DP are approximative momentum eigenstates. Finally, the mean momentum of DP is $\overline{p}_d = a\frac{\Delta E}{E}|k_i|$ or $\overline{p}_d = a\frac{\Delta E}{E_n}|k_i|$, where a is coefficient imported by the choosing of $|k|$ and kept unchanged for different energy E. The reason why k can be fixed at k_i and the coefficient a would be discussed in the following. The mean momentum of NP should be calculated by $\langle\Psi|\hat{p}|\Psi\rangle$, which should be normalized first. Again, under the help of energy distribution, the normalization process could be achieved easily by $\langle\Psi_{NP}|\Psi_{NP}\rangle E = E_n(E_n < E < E_m)$ or $\langle\Psi_{NP}|\Psi_{NP}\rangle E_n = E(E_m < E < E_n)$. So the sum of mean momentum $\overline{p} = \overline{p}_d + \overline{p}_c$.

Up to now, the expression of uncertainty relation can be written as $|\Delta E| \geq \frac{|\overline{p}_d + \overline{p}_c|}{2|x_d|}$. Fit the date collected in previous calculation by the equation $|\Delta E| = \frac{|\overline{p}_d + \overline{p}_c|}{2|x_d|}$, and the results are plotted in Figure 2. The sign of $\overline{p}_d$ depends on the diverging directions. Above result is not case-by-case, 1D hydrogen atom, limited depth potential well, and arbitrary potential well have similar results.

B. How to interpret the divergence in wavefunction?

Eigenstates of arbitrary energy have been confirmed to be divergent. So, what's the mean of divergence? It doesn't make sense to interpret it by probability directly. Comparing eigenfunctions of DS and CS, the biggest distinction is that the former is divergent, and the latter is convergent. While the one of them is stable, the other is unstable. So it's secure to conclude that divergent



FIG. 2. (Color on line)**Fitting results of uncertainty relation at DS of the segmented harmonic oscillator.** Choose the corresponding abscissa of a certain value of the derivative of the wavefunctions as x_d. The inner small figure shows the fitting results in the pattern of index of ten.

wavefunction at least suggests the state is unstable. Lots of Simulated calculation reveal that it should experience two possible process from DS to CS. (i), The energy remain unchanged, and self-tuning proceeds at inner DS to reach a more stable state, which is achieved by adjusting coefficient B_j to increase the size of Δx. This happens at α state; (ii), The state exchanges energy with outside to reach a more stable state, which is achieved by adjusting energy to get a bigger Δx. This happens at β state. DS will experience self-tuning and exchanging energy with outside to reach CS. It is obviously that the size of Δx is closely related to the stability of the state.

We have known that the total probability of the divergent part is $\frac{\Delta E}{E}$ or $\frac{\Delta E}{E_n}$, which is obviously limited. β state should exchange a part of energy with outside to reach CS. While, the energy distributed in DP is ΔE. For a normalized wavefunction, such as firgure 1, the divergence is still there, and the integration of $\oint \Psi^* \hat{H} \Psi \, \mathrm{dx}$ in whole NP is infinite. It is unacceptable. The normalized wavefunction should not be renormalized in spite of divergence, because DP and NP constitute a coherent unity. More over, the integration of $\oint \Psi^* \hat{H} \Psi \, \mathrm{dx}$ should be ΔE. So the integration of divergent part wavefunction should have its interval, namely $\oint_c \Psi \hat{H} \Psi^* \, \mathrm{dx} = \Delta \mathrm{E}$. The energy density $\Psi^* \hat{H} \Psi$ changes with space, the larger the $\Psi(x)$ is, the bigger the corresponding energy density is. At the area of minus infinity, $\Psi(-\infty)$ is infinitely great, as figure 1, and it's integration interval should be infinitely small. Finally the corresponding total energy is still ΔE. As we know, the NP of wavefunction is standing wave that the energy is not transmitting. From the angle of integration interval, the DP of wavefunction is traveling-like wave, which is energy transmitting. We argue that the divergent part of wavefunction denote the amplitude trail of a traveling wave. It's necessary to give a particular example to make further discussion. Considering an electro in a potential formed by electric field. In coordinate representation, if $\Psi(\mathbf{r})$ has been normalized by $\langle \Psi(\mathbf{r}) | \Psi(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = E$, $\Psi(\mathbf{r})^* \Psi(\mathbf{r})$ is the energy density, which equals to $\frac{1}{8\pi}(\hat{\mathbf{E}}^2 + \hat{\mathbf{B}}^2)$. Wavefunction is vibrating with time. It has implied that the energy distributed in space is vibrating with time, and the electromagnetic filed is vibrating as well. Remind that this kind of vibration of electromagnetic filed is not the electromagnetic wave. In the view of electrodynamics, the vibration of electromagnetic filed will radiate electromagnetic wave as well as energy. In quantum phenomena, radiation is also controlled by wavefunction. In NP, the energy just transform at inside, so there is no radiation. In DP, this part of energy is transferring alone in a velocity that much lower then light's[18]. When will it radiate an electromagnetic wave? The whole wavefunction is vibrating in the same tempo, but for different energy density, the radiating power is different. We consider that when radiating power times vibration period equals to ΔE, it's going to radiate an electromagnetic wave.

If a physical quantity is a function of space and time, its averaged value should averaged in space as well as time. Generally, it's unnecessary that stationary state average in time. But for a DS, the DP should averaged in time. Because the integration interval is changing while traveling, but the velocity of traveling keep unchanged, so the time of a certain integration interval kept is changing. In the NP, the averaged value of momentum should be a constant. The total probability is a constant, while k changes with space. We know that the averaging should also act on time. As a result, the total averaged momentum should be times by a coefficient a. Coefficient a is changed with space, but at a fixed point, a keep unchanged. So the mean momentum should be written as $\overline{p}_d = a\frac{\Delta E}{E}|k_i|$ or $\overline{p}_d = a\frac{\Delta E}{E_n}|k_i|$.

Under the help of integration interval, the total probability is limited. It can be interpreted as that the probability of find a particle at divergent area is $\oint_c \psi\psi^* \, \mathrm{dx}$. If this is true, it is going to radiate a particle other then a running wave. Actually, radiating a running wave is more reasonable and usual. It's necessary to figure out the relationship between probability and energy density.At energy eigenstate energy density $\psi^* \hat{H} \psi$ is just Probability $\psi^* \psi$ times energy E. Energy is detectable, the bigger the energy density is, the more signal the detector would receive, which is just treated as probability. Energy distribution not only eliminates the divergent difficulty but also provide a connection between wavefunction and a measurable physical quantity. Actually, the process of normalization is to guarantee the conservation of energy.

C. What's the difference of two diverging directions?

Up to now, the meaning of diverging direction is bright and clear. Namely, it suggests the state is going to absorb or release energy. Along with energy changing, when $\pm\beta$

state transform into $\mp\beta$ state, then there certainly is a steady state among them, which is helpful to obtain CS faster and to make sure that whether the result is reliable or not. It is quite reliable if around the obtained CS bring out $\pm\beta$ states. With self-tuning and exchanging energy, the wavefunctions at boundary will naturally adjust to zero or other patterns of convergence which should not be known before solving. This is more convincing than other solving process which need the boundary condition first.

So far, the three questions have been answered. All of evidences have proved that the wavefunctions of arbitrary energy are indeed divergent. Moreover, this kind of wavefunctions diverge with useful informations. Their next behavior is knowable by unscrambling these informations, which is meaningful in theory and practice.

D. Divergence criterion

It has already been proved that ΔE is related to Δx. Energy minimization principle is often used to obtain ground state, such as density function theory[11]. Energy minimization corresponds to $\Delta E = 0$, while Δx corresponds to the divergent extent of wavefunctions, which is related to stability. These make another criterion possible. Namely, whether the wavefunction is divergent is the criterion of whether the particle has reached steady state, and the precondition is that this kind of divergence is happened with that all continuity condition are well met, such as the divergence happened in CETM. It's obvious that this criterion is also suitable for excited states. Moreover it's more reliable than energy minimization principle. Because, energy minimization may be local, etc. While, CS obtained by divergence criterion is absolutely reliable. Because the stability of wavefunctions is directly determined by Δx. The bigger Δx is, the more stable the state is. As long as there is no divergence, Δx is absolutely quite big. Then the stability is naturally guaranteed. Under the circumstances, this criterion has a wide range of applications, such as thermodynamic simulation, many-body problem, time-dependent problem etc. Once you get a convergent wavefunction by any way which satisfies the precondition, you have obtained a steady state in physics.

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have established the 1D time-independent CETM based on TMM, which is an ideal tool to study DS. A package of evidences have confirmed the meaning of divergent states. DS is divergent, but It's carrying some useful informations, which can be fast unscrambled to get the CS with any precision. The concept of energy distribution has the ability to normalize DS and figure out the origin of probability. Finally, we have proposed the divergence criterion, which is quite reliable and effective , and suitable for exited states. In brief, treating energy as a continuous variate brings out divergence, but also brings us a series of advantages. CETM doesn't go against any of existing facts, and provides us a new way of solving and thinking. All of above make CETM and divergence criterion have a bright prospect for generalization.

[1] Namely, different shapes of wavefunction at boundary.
[2] B. R. Johnson, The J. of Che. Phys. **67**, 4086 (1977).
[3] C. S. Lent and D. J. Kirkner, J. Appl. Phys. **67**, 6353 (1990).
[4] J. P. Vigneron and P. Lambin, J. Phys. A **13**, 1135 (1980).
[5] A. K. Ghatak, K. Thyagarajan, and M. R. Shenoy, IEEE J. Quantum Electron. **24**, 1524 (1988).
[6] B. Jonsson, and S. T. Eng, IEEE J. Quantum Electron. **26**, 2025 (1990).
[7] D. C. Hutchings, Appl. Phys. Lett. **55**, 1082 (1989).
[8] C. Jirauschek, IEEE J. Quantum Electron. **45**, 1059 (2009).
[9] W. Li, IEEE J. Quantum Electron. **46**, 970 (2010).
[10] D. Biswas and V. Kumar, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 013301 (2014).
[11] D. Sanchez-Portal, P. Ordejon, E. Artacho, and J.M. Soler, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **65**, 453 (1997).
[12] J. B. Pendry, J. Phys. C **17**, 5317 (1984).
[13] Potentials mentioned in this work all suppose to denote real potential, not the approximation of any continuous potential.
[14] when $E < V_i$, $k_i = \pm i\kappa$, $\kappa = \sqrt{2m(V_i - E)}$, here we choose $k_i = i\kappa$.
[15] The time of solving 10 million segmented potential with double precision and single core is less than one second.
[16] It's mutually transformational between the real and image part of wavefunction. In our work, considering one of them is enough. Wavefunctions mentioned in the work are all about real part.
[17] The continuous condition is quite basic in quantum mechanics, which guarantees the conservations of energy and momentum.
[18] At DP, we find that energy and momentum has a linear relation.